

### REMARKS

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on July 23, 2007. Claims 15-28 are standing for examination. The Examiner states the Information Disclosure Statement fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. Claims 15-18, 20-25 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Austin (US 6,157,924) hereinafter Austin. Claims 19 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Austin in view of Bateman (5,884,032) hereinafter Bateman.

Applicant has carefully studied the prior art cited and applied by the Examiner, and the Examiner's rejections and statements in the instant Office Action. In response, applicant herein provides argument clearly showing that the art of Austin fails to anticipate the claims of applicant's invention. Applicant herein amends claim 16 for clarification.

Regarding the rejection of applicant's independent claims 15 and 22, the Examiner states that Austin teaches a user support system including an information software configured to a specific user (col. 12 lines 28-46); wherein, upon a contact from the specific user, the information software presents to the user an interface automatically updated with available information according to the user interaction and/or request (col. 12 lines 40-67).

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's statement that Austin teaches software configured to a specific user or that the software presents to the user an interface automatically updated with available information according to the user interaction and/or request. Applicant argues that column 12 of Austin teaches alternative messaging operations limited to an ability to adhere to a media choice made by a user in a request for information, or, if the user does not specify media preference in the request, accessing a user profile to determine the media preference listed in the user's profile.

Applicant points out that claim 15 and 22 both recite information software is configured to a specific user. Applicant argues that Austin's ability to provide information to a user in a specified media (either by request or stored) cannot read on

applicant's claimed ability of configuring information *software* for a specified user. The limitation of configuration to a specific user therefore renders the claim patentable over Austin.

Applicant's claims recite; "upon a contact from the specific user, the information software presents to the user an interface automatically updated with available information according to user interaction and/or request. The portion of Austin relied upon by the Examiner specifically recites; "...a user profile is stored within one or more database servers. A user (customer) requests information from a business via the Statement Distribution Application 52 (FIG. 3). The Statement Distribution Application may update the user's profile to include additional information or to modify or delete existing information.

Referring now to FIG. 6B, a user may modify his/ her user profile (Block 102). An information provider may also modify a user's profile and or a user's profile may be modified automatically via information received via a user's requests (Block 104). The term "modify" includes adding data, changing existing data, and deleting data within a user profile. In the Bank U.S.A. example, a user (customer) may make additions, changes and or deletions to his her profile via the Statement Distribution Application.

Referring now to FIG. 6C, a user may specify one or more delivery media with his her request for information (Block 112). If a delivery medium is specified in a user request for information, the specified delivery medium is used (Block 114). If no specification as to delivery medium accompanies the information request, the user profile is searched to determine the user's preferred delivery medium (or media) (Block 120). In the Bank U.S.A. example, user profile searching (Block 120) is carried out via the Statement Distribution Application which searches the user profile located within the database server. The requested information is then retrieved (Block 130)."

Applicant points out that nowhere in the above teaching of Austin is there any text relating to applicant's limitation reciting; "upon a contact from the specific user, the information software *presents to the user an interface automatically updated with available information* according to user interaction and/or request. (Emphasis added)

Applicant argues that the limitation “automatically updated with available information” does not relate to selecting a media type in response to an information request” as taught in Austin. In applicant’s invention, based on a previous request of information and/or based on a user’s previous interactions wizard 423 enables a client networking with a CINOS-enhanced enterprise to gain access to a host of pre-prepared automated responses that are tailored to specific products or services of interest to the client. In the case of an enterprise business associate such as an outside vendor, those responses are tailored to the exact nature of the associate's business with the enterprise. In this manner a user, when initially accessing the interface may instantaneously be presented with desired information without having to interact with the interface or directly request the information. Austin fails to teach such an ability.

Therefore, the 102(e) rejection fails and claims 15 and 22 are patentable over the art of Austin. Dependent claims 16-21 and 23-28 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

As all of the claims are clearly patentable over the art cited and applied, applicant respectfully requests that this application be reconsidered, the claims be allowed, and that this case be passed quickly to issue.

If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully submitted,  
Christopher Clemmet Macleod Beck et al.

By /Donald R. Boys/  
Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc.  
3 Hangar Way, Suite D  
Watsonville, CA 95076  
831-768-1755